



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/398,307	09/20/1999	SHAWN W. HOGBERG	IRI03778	9914

7590 12/13/2002

VINCENT B INGRASSIA  
MOTOROLA INC INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT  
SUITE R3108  
P O BOX 10219  
SCOTTSDALE, AZ 852710219

EXAMINER

RAMOS FELICIANO, ELISEO

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2682

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**Application No.  
**09/398,307**Applicant(s)  
**HOGBERG et al.**Examiner  
**ELISEO RAMOS-FELICIANO**Art Unit  
**2682**

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED Dec 2, 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE:

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See attachment.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_
- Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_
- Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_
8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

VIVIAN CHIN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Art Unit: 2682

**ADVISORY ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed December 2, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant argues that the concepts of sub-band and sub-band assignment are not disclosed in the prior art of record. The examiner disagrees because of the explanation found in the final Office action (Paper No. 4), mailed on October 24, 2002. Paragraph 2 explains that Natarajan et al. discloses that the bandwidth is divided (segmented) in groups of channels named "pool of channels" (sub-band), wherein each "pool" (sub-band) is assigned to a different cell, see Figure 3, step 110, column 1, lines 14-37, and column 6, lines 23-25. Natarajan et al.'s "pool of channels" read as the claimed sub-bands. The allocation or assignment of channels is dynamic, see e.g. the title, column 1, lines 6-11.
3. Applicant's arguments convey the idea that within a cell different sub-bands may have different power requirements, as if within a single cell different power requirements can be managed. These are limitations not found in the rejected claims.
4. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., that the claimed steps are "within a cell") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

**ELISEO RAMOS-FELICIANO**  
**PATENT EXAMINER**

ERF/erf

April 19, 2002.